BARRY GLASSMAN
HARFORD COUNTY EXECUTIVE

BILLY BONIFACE
DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION

KAREN D. MYERS, CPPB
DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT

INVITATIONS FOR BIDS NO. 16-074

COUNTRY WALK FACILITY 1B STORMWATER RETROFIT

ADDENDUM NO. 1

October 21, 2016

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The purpose of this addendum is to provide clarification(s) to prospective bidders.

As mentioned at the pre-bid meeting, soil testing was performed in the north cell area. No contaminant concentrations of concern were detected. A copy of the letter report is attached for your reference.

QUESTION NO. 1: Is there a cost estimate?

ANSWER NO. 1: The cost estimate is between $260,000 and $300,000.

QUESTION NO. 2: Are there union requirements for this project?

ANSWER NO. 2: There are no union requirements.

QUESTION NO. 3: On sheet 6 of 13 the pump around is referenced to be run through the existing storm drain piping, however the detail shows utilizing a pipe bridge. If feasible could the diversion be run through the existing 18" storm drain?

ANSWER NO. 3: It is recommended that the pump around for the installation of the CIPP be over Cinnabar La in a pipe bridge as shown in the detail on Sheet 8 and the pump around for the north cell excavation and low flow pipe installation be through the barrel pipe.

QUESTION NO. 4: As discussed during the pre-bid meeting, would the County be open to alternatives to the proposed CIPP lining option? We would like consideration for an alternative spray on liner option; GeoKrete for review by RK&K.

ANSWER NO. 4: There are time constraints on this project as a result of the stream closure period and grant funding. As such, the approval of an alternative is not feasible, as revised hydraulic computations would be required as well as permit review and approval by Harford County and NRCS.

QUESTION NO. 5: Why was slip lining not considered for this rehab operation? There are liner options available with an inside diameter that is close to the proposed CIPP liner.

ANSWER NO. 5: The following alternatives were evaluated: 1) large diameter sliplining 2) spiral wound liners 3) CIPP 4) cementious coatings 5) epoxy/geopolymer coating 6) new construction. CIPP was the preferred alternative given existing site and pipe conditions and hydraulic function.

Should you have additional questions regarding this project, please do not hesitate to contact me at fmdimeo@harfordcountymd.gov .

Sincerely,

Fred M. DiMeo
Procurement Agent

FMD/kmd

cc: Betsy Collins, DPW/Construction Management

GEO-TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATES, INC.

GEOTECHNICAL AND
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

A Practicing Geoprofessional Business Association Member Firm

December 2, 2015

Harford County Department of Public Works
Division of Construction Management
15 North Bond Street
Bel Air, MD 21014

Attn: Ms. Betsy Collins

Re: ***Country Walk Pond 1B Soil Sampling***
Country Walk Development – Wheel Road and Cinnabar Lane
Harford County, Maryland
GTA Project No.: 152175

Dear Ms. Collins:

In accordance with our agreement dated October 27, 2015, Geo-Technology Associates, Inc. (GTA) has performed soil sampling on the above referenced property. GTA personnel visited the site on November 18, 2015 and collected one composite soil sample from an area within the reported limits of the North Cell pond, adjacent to the intersection of Cinnabar Lane and West Wheel Road in Harford County, Maryland. The composite soil sample (designated NCP-1) was analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) via United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Method 8260, semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) via USEPA Method 8270, total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) diesel range organics (DRO) and gasoline range organics via USEPA Method 8015, priority pollutant metals via USEPA Method 6020, hexavalent chromium via USEPA Method 7196, priority pollutant pesticides via USEPA Method 8081, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) via USEPA Method 8082. A table summarizing the laboratory results and the laboratory analytical package are attached to this letter.

The soil sample was analyzed for total chromium and was also speciated for hexavalent chromium (Cr VI). Since hexavalent chromium was not detected, the concentration of total chromium (52 mg/kg) consists of tri-valent chromium (Cr III), with a Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) Residential Cleanup Standard (RCS) of 12,000 mg/kg. Arsenic was detected in the sample at a concentration of 2.3 mg/kg. While the MDE RCS for arsenic is 0.43 mg/kg, the naturally occurring concentration of arsenic in the soils of the eastern region of Maryland is listed as 3.6 mg/kg and for the central region of Maryland as 4.9 mg/kg. These values are presented in the *MDE Cleanup Standards for Soil and Groundwater: Interim Final Guidance (Update No. 2.1)*; June 2008. The MDE Guidance Document indicates that when an

3445-A Box Hill Corporate Center Drive, Abingdon, MD 21009 (410) 515-9446 Fax: (410) 515-4895

✦ Abingdon, MD ✦ Baltimore, MD ✦ Laurel, MD ✦ Frederick, MD ✦ Waldorf, MD ✦ Sterling, VA
✦ Fredericksburg, VA ✦ Malvern, OH ✦ Somerset, NJ ✦ NYC Metro ✦ New Castle, DE
✦ Georgetown, DE ✦ York, PA ✦ Quakertown, PA ✦ Towanda, PA ✦ Charlotte, NC ✦ Raleigh, NC

Visit us on the web at www.gtaeng.com

ATC concentration for a given province exceeds the proposed cleanup standard, the ATC value may be proposed as an acceptable alternative. Therefore, the concentration of arsenic reported in the soil sample is consistent with naturally occurring concentrations in the area.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of assistance on this project. Should you have any questions regarding this information, or should you require additional information, please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Sincerely,
GEO-TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATES, INC.

Benjamin G. Myers, P.E.
Associate

BGM/MDR/mlw
152175
L:\Shared\Env\Reports\2015 Projects\152175 - Country Walk 1B - HCDPW\Report\152175 Country Walk 1B - Soil Sampling Letter.docx

Attachments:

- Table 1 – Soil Sample Analytical Results (*1 page*)
- Laboratory Analytical Data Package (*26 pages*)